DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 188 95 SP 013 767

AUTHOR Krueger, Christine
TITLE Universities and Teacher Education Centers in Florida.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Dec 78
GRANT G007700121 A01
NOTE 94p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Needs Assessment; *Program Improvement; *Schools of Education; Statistical Analysis; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on the role of universities in teacher education centers in the state of Florida as well as on some of the issues and impacts related to that role. Research makes it clear that universities, almost entirely through colleges of education, have contributed substantially to the improvement of inservice education. Several factors have combined, however, to limit both that contribution and the potential role of colleges of education in Florida's teacher education centers. These factors include: (1) the focus on inservice education; (2) the weakness in collaborative relationships; (3) the lack of Teacher Education Center (TEC) program development in the universities; (4) policy instability; (5) shortage of resources; (6) the larger university system; and (7) the tenuous development of university organization for TEC activity. The institutionalization of TEC roles would help consolidate TEC goals as part of the university mission and lessen anxieties about the role of universities in teacher education centers. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UNIVERSITIES AND TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS IN FLORIDA

Christine Krueger
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
December 1978

SP013 767

This document was supported by funds from the University of Florida/Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project

USOE Grant No. G007700121 A01

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this report was supported by the University of Florida/Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project. The author would like to acknowledge the assistance and encouragement of project director Suzanne Kinzer and associate director William Drummond.

Throughout the research effort, the cooperation of university teacher education center coordinators, college of education faculty, staff of the Department of Education and the Board of Regents and others interviewed, not only provided me with data but made research an enjoyable learning experience.

I would like to thank especially the college of education faculty and the teacher education center advisory council members who gave their time to respond to lengthy questionnaires.

The support, suggestions, and assistance of Roberta Hughey throughout the research period and especially in editing this report have been invaluable.

Tad Hanna and Ann Garwood lent both technical skill and patience throughout the labors of rough drafts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
THE DISTRIBUTION OF TEC'S IN FLORIDA	4
INSERVICE EDUCATION: SOME CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION	7
UNIVERSITIES: STRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS	12
SOME EFFECTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS ON COLLEGES OF EDUCATION	18
COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS - FOCUS ON COLLEGES OF EDUCATION	23
TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER SERVICE AND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY	29
SUMMARY, ISSUES, AND IMPLICATIONS	36
A CONCEPTUAL NOTE	46
A NOTE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCESS	47
APPENDIX A	48
APPENDIX B	50
APPENDIX C	58
APPENDIX D	66
APPENDIX E	70
APPENDIX F	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
APPENDIX B	50
1. Mean Figures of Six Variables for Five School District Groupings in the State of Florida	50
2. Distribution of Counties, Instructional Personnel and Pupil Membership According to District Grouping	51
3. Teacher Education Center School Districts by Year of Entrance into TEC and District Grouping	52
3a. Distribution of School Districts in TEC by District Grouping, 1974-75 and 1977-78	53
4. TEC Counties and Instructional Personnel in Relation to District Groupings	53
5. Percent (Estimate) of Services Obtained by 15 TECs in 1977-78 by Source of Service (State University System, private institutions, non-higher education sources)	54
6. Estimated SUS/TEC Service Days for 1977-78 by District Grouping	55
7. TEC Service Allocations (in days) for 1977-78 by University Providing Services and TEC Requesting Services	56
APPENDIX C	58
1. Advisory Council Members and College of Education Faculty Perceptions of the Contribution of TEC Activity and the Present Situation with Respect to Improvements in the Delivery, Content, Amount of Inservice Education and Integration with Preservice Education	58
2. Advisory Council Members and College of Education Faculty Perceptions of the Impact of TEC Activity and the Present Situation in the Colleges of Education	59

Table

Page

3. Satisfaction with the Way the COE/TEC System Currently Functions 60

4. The Contribution of TEC's in Florida and the Present Situation with Respect to the Improvement in Relationships Between Teachers and Other Teachers, Administrators, Students and Parents 61

5. Are the colleges of education currently providing your TEC with the kinds of services most needed in the inservice education of teachers? 62

6. How would you rate the quality of the services provided by the institution of higher education with which your TEC works most frequently? 63

7. Are you generally satisfied with the amount of service available to your TEC through the various institutions of higher education? 63

8. Do the following statements apply to the college of education personnel who have provided services through your TEC? . 64

9. Do university representatives collaborate in the assessment of inservice needs, planning and evaluation of inservice education offered through your TEC? 65

APPENDIX D 66

1. Are you in agreement with the trend to 66

2. How Do You Rate the Potential Contribution of Your COE to the TECs it Serves? 67

3. To What Would You Attribute Your Involvement in TEC Activity? 67

4. Impact of TEC on Colleges of Education and Present Situation with Respect to Pressure on Resources and COE Mission . 68

5. What Percent (%) of Your Time Did/Do/Will You Spend in TEC Activity and Public Service in 1975-76, 1977-78, 1979-80? 69

APPENDIX E 70

1. The Contribution of TEC and the Present Situation with Respect to the Improvement in Relationships Between Collaborative Groups 70

Table | Page

2. Have you been asked to participate in any college of education activities (committees, studies, seminars, etc.) as a result of your TEC work? 70

3. COE-TEC Collaboration 71

4. Obstacles to the Development of More Effective Collaboration Between TECs and the Institutions of Higher Education . 72

5. Six Most Frequently Mentioned Obstacles to TEC Collaboration by TEC Subgroup Citing Obstacle 73

6. Sources Which Have Helped or Hindered Effective Collaboration Between Colleges of Education and Teacher Education Centers 74

7. Respondent Group by Rating of Collaboration for TEC Among Universities 75

APPENDIX F 76

1. Distribution of Respondents According to Amount of Time Spent in TEC Activity 76

2. Basis of Assignment to TEC Activity 76

3. Types of TEC Activities Performed in 1977-78 by All Respondents; More and Less Active Respondents 77

4. Number of COE-TEC Faculty According to Level of Activity and Kinds of Activities Performed in 1977-78 78

5. Impact of TEC Activity and Present Situation with Respect to Several Aspects of COE Faculty Role 79

6. Preferences Indicated for University-Teacher Education Center Service Based on Contracts 80

7. Number of Cases and Effect of TEC Activity on Tenure, Promotion and Salary Increases 81

8. Status of Rewards for TEC Service as Perceived by COE Faculty 81

9. Comparison of Professional Rewards for TEC Activity With Rewards for Other Faculty Activities as Perceived by COE Faculty 81

INTRODUCTION

Inservice education through teacher education centers of various types has been a growing phenomenon in the United States for more than a decade. In Florida, the Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 assigned joint responsibility for teacher education to the teaching profession, the school districts, and the universities, thus making Florida the first state to legislate a collaborative approach to teacher education at all levels. Documentation of the development of teacher education centers (TEC) in Florida has been an ongoing effort of the University of Florida supported by Teacher Corps, since 1975. While documentation of the Florida experience is important in its own right, it has taken on additional meaning since the passage of federal teacher education center legislation which closely resembles that of Florida.

The present report focuses on the role of universities in teacher education centers in the State of Florida as well as on some of the issues and impacts related to that role.

The research on which this report is based was carried out between September, 1977 and May, 1978 by a Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology at the University of Florida employed as a research assistant by the University of Florida/Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project. The study plans included the following:

(1) Notes and observations at six statewide TEC directors and university representatives meetings and other relevant meetings during the same period. Of special importance were two meetings of university representatives for

TEC coordination held at Florida Technological University in Orlando in October and December of 1977.

(2) Personal interviews with COE faculty involved in administering and delivering services through teacher education centers at the nine universities in the Florida State University System (SUS). In almost all instances, interviews were arranged by the TEC service coordinator at the particular institution, though some interviews were arranged at the specific request of the researcher and a few occurred spontaneously. About five faculty members were interviewed at each institution for about 30 minutes each. Interviews with coordinators were usually about 90 minutes. Three college of education deans and one university academic vice president were interviewed for approximately 30 minutes each.

Members of the Department of Education, the Board of Regents, and the Senate Education Committee were also interviewed.

(3) Review of documents contained in the Teacher Center archives at the University of Florida or obtained from persons interviewed.

(4) Written questionnaires to university TEC representatives, college of education faculty, and TEC advisory council members. A total of 205 questionnaires were returned, 11 from university representatives, 89 from TEC advisory council members, and 105 from college of education faculty, 72 of whom had delivered services through teacher education centers during 1977-78.

Some of the questions raised early in the research period and which influenced the direction of subsequent research were the following: Just what was the system for university involvement in teacher education centers? Was it really collaborative? Was it a system at all? Was whatever system

that existed one which approached what the legislative intent had been? What were some of the factors which had influenced the development of the legislation? How basic were the concerns expressed by interviewees and in meetings? Were the problems raised indicative of development of barriers against it?

While this report attempts to address those questions, its content is also intended to reflect the perceptions of those directly involved in or close to university participation in teacher education centers. There are two basic reasons for this approach. First, the range of topics and geographical locations to be covered did not permit intensive independent observation of ongoing processes. Secondly, the researcher believes that the university role in TEC is not only influenced by structural and historical realities, but also by the understanding, skills, and commitments of the people involved.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF TEC'S IN FLORIDA

In 1974-75, the first year for state approved TECs in Florida, the ten original centers represented approximately one-third of the state's 67 school districts, 19.5 percent of all instructional personnel, and 18.8 percent of the pupil membership of the entire state.[1] By April, 1978, although TECs existed in twice as many districts, these accounted for slightly more than one-third of the total instructional personnel and pupils in the state.

In order to further examine the distribution of TECs, an analysis was made using district groupings defined by the Florida DOE's Division of Public Schools. The groupings are based on a weighted index derived from five variables "which have been shown to be closely related to many of the factors affecting education"[2]: population size, average family income, percent urban, median education, and number of white collar workers. (Appendix B, Table 1 shows the mean characteristics for the five groupings on urban/rural population, number of white-collar workers, median family income, median years schooling, and inservice education/training budget.)

Data on instructional personnel and pupil membership show that about 85 percent are concentrated in Florida's 24 primarily urban school districts and the remaining 15 percent are scattered throughout 43 primarily rural school districts. (Appendix B, Table 2.) The distribution of teacher education

---

[1] In Florida, county and school district boundaries are coterminous. Figures are based on data provided in the Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1976-77, the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, Division of Public Schools, Vol. II.

[2] No explanation of the precise effects of those variables is given.

centers throughout the state shows that they tend to be located in more rural school districts, a tendency which has become more pronounced, when distribution of centers in 1974-75 is compared with that for 1977-78 (See Tables 3 and 3a, Appendix B). This relatively rural distribution means that even though two-thirds of the state's school districts operated TECs in 1977-78, they had a potential population of only slightly more than one-third of the state's instructional personnel. (Appendix B, Table 4 gives the concentration of instructional personnel in TEC districts and for the entire state).

Distribution of University Services through TEC

What do these statistics imply for the State University System which provides about 80 percent of the services delivered through teacher education centers? (Appendix B, Table 5.) According to figures derived from SUS estimates for 1977-78, 60 percent of university services through TECs are delivered in the primarily urban districts which include 26 percent of the state's instructional personnel and 40 percent in the primarily rural districts which include 9.3 percent of the instructional personnel. (Appendix B, Table 6.)

In interviews with college of education faculty, the time consumed in traveling to the service sites was identified as a major problem. By 1977-78, most universities had found it necessary to use formulas which computed travel as well as planning and "contact" time (time spent in actual on-site delivery of service). One institution's projection for the 1978-79 school year indicated that travel would account for 27 percent of the time allocated for TEC-delivered services. While such accounting permitted a more adequate compensation to faculty members whose on-campus assignments were altered according to their involvement in TECs, the difficulties associated with travel did not disappear. No university was free from the complaint that

often the distance-travel factor made TEC service burdensome.

Summary

Analysis by district grouping shows that SUS/TEC services tend to be utilized by counties which are typically more rural and less well-endowed with resources for inservice education. That is, it appears that SUS/TEC services are largely delivered in counties where accessibility is more difficult and where inservice education would otherwise be less available.

While legislation specifies that all counties should operate teacher education centers by 1979, until the present establishment of TECs has been voluntary. As a result the present distribution of TECs is likely to represent a process wherein counties least able to meet their needs for inservice teacher education and/or those most closely located to university institutions have been more inclined to establish TECs. Conversely, interviews with college of education faculty whose institutions are located in the state's larger and wealthier counties indicate that school district personnel in these counties have resisted entrance into teacher education centers because they are reluctant to abdicate control over the relatively large budgets for inservice education which they currently manage.

INSERVICE EDUCATION: SOME CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

To establish a context for looking at the role of colleges of education in Florida teacher education centers, it is appropriate to consider whether teacher centers, after four years of operation in the state, have affected inservice education. While the answer requires an objective assessment of the nature, extent, and sources of change, it is also valuable to look at the perceptions of participants. In interviews and on questionnaires, college of education faculty and local TEC advisory council members considered some of the effects of TEC on inservice education and some of the contributions of colleges of education.

TEC Effects on Some Areas of Inservice Education

The contribution of TEC to improvements in the delivery, content, and amount of inservice education was reported as great by advisory council members and as some by college of education faculty. The majority of respondents from both groups said that the present situation in these dimensions of inservice education was satisfactory. (For about one-third of the advisory council members, the present situation was very good, while 20 to 25 percent of the COE respondents said that it was unsatisfactory.) (Appendix C, Table 7.)

Both respondent groups perceived that TEC had made little or no contribution to the integration of preservice and inservice teacher education. This situation was regarded as comparatively unsatisfactory by both groups, though more frequently by COE faculty.

For two of these items, respondents were asked to judge the impact of TEC on the colleges of education (Appendix C, Table 2). The responses of COE faculty showed the same patterns as for the previous question: TEC had some impact on the development of mechanisms for the delivery of off-campus services and little or no impact on the integration of inservice and preservice education.

The responses of advisory council members, however, were different. On the previous question they had indicated a great TEC contribution to improvement in the delivery of inservice education. On this question, they indicated only some impact on the development of mechanisms (in the colleges of education) for the delivery of off-campus services and they more frequently reported the situation as unsatisfactory. For integration of preservice and inservice education, advisory council members again said, but this time in greater numbers, that little or no impact had been made and that the situation was unsatisfactory.

Respondents also indicated their perception of the TEC contribution to the improvement in relationships between teachers and other role groups with whom they are involved professionally--other teachers, administrators, students, and parents (Appendix C, Table 4). Only a few respondents said that TEC had made a great contribution to improvement of these relationships. The majority of advisory council members said that some contribution had been made toward better relationships with administrators, other teachers and students, 48.2 percent perceived little or no contribution to teacher-parent relationships. In all these areas, the majority said that relationships were satisfactory, though parent-teacher relationships fell lower in this response. COE faculty perceptions were generally the same, though many respondents left the items unanswered.

Contribution of the Colleges of Education

In other items, advisory council members were asked whether colleges

of education were currently providing their centers with the kinds of services they needed most. The majority of the respondents said that colleges of education provided these services better than any other source; only seven respondents said that most-needed services were obtained from other sources and that colleges of education tended to meet secondary needs. Almost two-thirds said that the services provided by the colleges of education were very good or excellent; a third said that they were good or fair. More than one-fourth of the respondents said that the services offered by colleges of education reflected professors' expertise rather than teachers' needs. One-fifth felt that colleges of education were not really providing services that they might (Appendix C, Tables 5, 6, 7).

On an item which treated the contribution of COE faculty, advisory council respondents said that many or most of them were strongly committed to providing good inservice training (59.6%), and had a good sense of classroom and teacher inservice needs (56.1%). They also said that many or most could profit from a planned staff development program for COE-TEC faculty (52.8%) and tended to the opinion that some were interested in learning as well as teaching and were able collaborators in TEC matters (Appendix C, Table 8).

In the areas of TEC needs assessment, planning and evaluation through their TECs, more than a third of the advisory council respondents (Appendix C, Table 9) said that university representatives usually participated in needs assessment and planning, and almost as many said they sometimes participated. About two-thirds said that participation in needs assessment was sufficient; only a few felt that it was insufficient.

Participation in the evaluation of inservice education was less frequent than in needs assessment and planning. Thirty-seven percent of the advisory council respondents said that university representatives participated

sometimes; less than one-fourth said usually. More respondents said that participation in evaluation (compared to needs assessment and planning) was insufficient (22.5%), but the greater number (46.1%) said that it was sufficient.

These data seem to suggest that, at least as perceived by TEC advisory council members, participation by college of education faculty in the needs assessment, planning and evaluation associated with inservice education is not the usual pattern, but that the existing pattern is satisfactory.

In contrast, college of education faculty interviewed often felt their contribution through TEC was too limited to the delivery of specific services. A better contribution would be made, they said, if there were a greater opportunity to participate in other aspects of inservice education, especially needs assessment, planning and evaluation. The analysis of activities performed by COE faculty shows these activities performed to some extent by about one-third to one-half of the COE respondents active in TEC work in 1977-78 (Appendix F, Table 3).

Summary

Both college of education faculty and TEC advisory council members perceived teacher education centers as having made a contribution to the quality and quantity of inservice education as well as to the relationships between teachers and other role groups. Advisory council members were generally more positive in their endorsements than were college of education faculty.

There may be some discrepancy between the role college of education faculty would like to play in TECs and that which advisory council members expect. Although council members are satisfied with existing faculty

contributions, COE faculty would like to expand their TEC participation in such activities as needs assessment, planning, and evaluation. And while council members appreciate college of education services and faculty, a majority indicated that a planned program of professional development would benefit TEC/COE faculty members.

UNIVERSITIES:

STRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

In an earlier study on the implementation of teacher education centers, Van Fleet wrote that prescribed organizational changes required the development of new sets of activities and social relations necessary to establish a new system for teacher education, a system based on shared responsibility and collaborative decision-making to an extent unprecedented in the State.[1]

This section describes the roles, activities, and broad organizational structures which have emerged from and which shape university involvement in teacher education centers.

At the outset it should be clarified that while organization for TEC varies somewhat from university to university, it is located almost totally within the colleges of education and can be broadly conceptualized in terms of primary and secondary levels. The primary level is more directly related to the actual provision of inservice education at off-campus sites. The secondary level is more directly linked to administrative structures of the universities and colleges of education.

Primary Organization for TEC

In spite of differences from institution to institution, some roles can be identified as fundamental to the primary university organization for TEC. What are these and what are some of the factors that have affected their development?

---

[1] VanFleet, Alanson Alva, The Problems of Implementing Florida's Teacher Education Centers: An Anthropological Perspectives on Organizational Change in Education, Dissertation, University of Florida, 1977.

The most elementary form of university organization for TEC activity is based on the roles of contact person and consultant. The contact person in most cases is a faculty member directly responsible to the dean of the college of education. Activities associated with the role are virtually all those which the organized delivery of services requires. The contact person receives requests from the field, matches requests to consultants who eventually provide the service, attends to the administrative detail needed to account for services, and represents the institution at meetings and to other agencies related to TEC. These may include advisory council meetings held by the centers, or another faculty person may serve as advisory council member.

Consultant refers to persons who provide the actual field service, a function which incorporates a number of activities depending on the nature of the service provided. Some services may require only a conversation with the TEC director or representative of the client group prior to the delivery of service. In other instances, more prolonged planning and program design may be needed, as when consultants may assist in assessing or evaluating district or school inservice needs. While a consultant's activities vary according to the nature of the service requested, he/she maintains a provider role in university-TEC organization.

In contrast, when organization for TEC activity is more elaborate, the activities performed by the contact person are more specialized and differentiate toward three separate roles--coordinator (or director), administrative assistant, and liaison (or facilitator).

The coordinator or director is an in-house administrator of TEC activity and represents the institution to other agencies such as universities,

the statewide TEC directors-university representatives group, and Department of Education staff (DOE). Like the contact person, the coordinator is directly responsible to the college of education dean or academic vice president and in most cases is an associate or assistant dean.

Administrative assistant refers to the existence of at least a half-time position to assist the coordinator with paperwork and accounting. While some secretarial help is always available to the coordinator or contact person, in simpler forms of organization it is not a separately defined job but rather one done in time borrowed from other responsibilities.

The existence of the liaison role represents the most significant differentiation in university organization for TEC activity. The liaison is a COE faculty member assigned (part-time) to work on-site with a specific county or group of counties in a continuous relationship. Responsibilities include a wide range of TEC activities from needs assessment and planning through the arrangement for services to be performed and participation in the TEC advisory council.

As said above, university-TEC role of advisory council member varies. In some cases it is actually a liaison-type activity which includes facilitating service arrangements by reporting back to the coordinator on campus. In others, it merely involves representing the university at the meetings, while service arrangements are made separately through the TEC director and the university contact person/coordinator.

Variables Associated with Role Differentiation

Three variables seem to be associated with the degree of role differentiation from university to university. These are:

(1) the importance reportedly attributed to TEC service by higher administration;

(2) the amount of TEC services provided; and

(3) the immediacy of the university to the points of service delivery.

The university which has evolved the most elaborate organization for TEC activity is simultaneously an institution which has reportedly enjoyed a commitment by higher administration to the development of that service, which has provided the greatest amount of TEC service, and which is located in a comparatively urbanized area of the state. Two features distinguish organization for TEC at this institution--the importance of the liaison role and the existence of a coordinating council composed of representatives from the university and from the various teacher education centers through which inservice education is provided. One director whose TEC collaborates formally with three different universities remarked that the relationship with this particular institution was most efficient because of the internal organization which had been established around service to the centers.

While questionnaire data indicated that most college of education faculty were satisfied with the administration of TEC services at the COE level, support for TEC has varied among COE deans. Some have promoted its development; others have merely complied with legislative requirements. Institutions whose organization of TEC was less differentiated tended to be those where upper level administrators (academic vice presidents and/or college of education deans) were less supportive of TEC.

Another variable which may be significantly related to university organization for TEC is the nature of the service area with respect to amount of service and accessibility. Universities in the far southern part of the state where surrounding counties have remained outside TEC have a contact person-consultant organization for TEC. Most universities in the northern part of the state have shown a comparatively high level of service provision, but are generally located in more rural areas and do not have strongly differentiated liaison roles. The nature of the liaison role as one which requires continual travel to off-campus sites suggests that at the present level of faculty resources, its further development may be curtailed.

Secondary Organization for TEC

The roles and organizational developments discussed so far pertain to the primary level of university-TEC organization. In contrast to factors associated with the development of the primary system, the secondary system is determined by its relationship to general university organization. This secondary system includes vice presidents who control the budget, offices of continuing education which participate in matters pertaining to contracts and accounting, and other off-campus programs with which some coordination is required.

Contact persons and coordinators in almost all institutions felt that the secondary system limited more effective organization for TEC activity. Some vice presidents reportedly disagreed in principle with the service commitment implied by TEC. Some objected to earmarked funding for TEC and administered the budget in ways that made planning and coordination difficult. In some instances, university-TEC coordinators remained without precise budget information several weeks after the service year had begun.

Questionnaire data showed that college of education faculty involved in TEC perceived both university level administration and policy as well as

Board of Regents policy as hindrances to more effective university response to TEC (Appendix D, Table 6). Interview data has suggested that "university administration/policy outside the colleges of education" refers to both the interference and/or limitations which originate in the secondary system, and the tendency of university-wide promotion and tenure committees to give TEC activity less recognition than other faculty activities. The latter was recognized as a problem within the colleges of education as well, though to a lesser degree.

Relationships with continuing education and other off-campus programs were in some cases described as helpful and in others as increasing the red tape attached to service arrangements. In the opinion of most coordinators or contact persons, organization of TEC activity would be more effective if it were more independently and clearly defined, instead of attached to or partly controlled by other administrative offices.

Summary

No precedent exists for defining how much or what kind of organization for TEC activity is best. University representatives agreed that one prerequisite was that each institution have the flexibility to operate in a manner compatible with that institution's particular obligations, resources, and circumstances.

While the organization for TEC which exists at various institutions does indeed vary, research suggests that organizational development has been strongly influenced by limiting factors in the university system as well as from the service field. College of education faculty felt that organizational weaknesses found in the universities resided outside rather than within the colleges of education.

SOME EFFECTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS ON COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

The previous section focuses on the organizational structure which has developed in the universities in response to involvement in inservice education through teacher education centers. This section continues the description of some of the effects of TEC on colleges of education and college of education faculty.

A Broader Mission for the Colleges of Education

Responses to several questionnaire items showed that virtually all COE faculty (96.2%), both those active and those not active in TEC, favored college of education involvement in inservice teacher education. Support was also strong (78.2%) for expanding the off-campus clientele of colleges of education (Appendix D, Table 1). More than three-fourths (78.1%) of the 105 respondents rated the potential contribution of their institution to TEC as high or very high (Appendix D, Table 2), and 73.6 percent of those active in TEC cited their desire to participate in inservice teacher education as a motivating factor (Appendix D, Table 3). At the same time most COE respondents felt that while TEC had broadened the mission of the colleges of education and it had also created anxiety about their role in teacher education. About half said that the present situation was satisfactory, and about a third or more found it unsatisfactory (Appendix D, Table 4). In light of the strong support for a broader mission reported above, these responses may be interpreted as indicating 1) while the COE mission has been somewhat broadened through TEC, almost a third of the respondents felt it should be broader still; 2) some either saw anxiety

about the traditional COE role as positive or felt that it was not strong enough to be rated as unsatisfactory. Both a broader mission and increased anxiety may be explained by another impact of TEC: greater pressure placed on already limited resources

Pressure on COE Resources

Along with their support for TEC involvement, COE faculty perceived that the strongest impact of TEC on colleges of education has been greater pressure placed on already limited resources (Appendix D, Table 4). It is also the most negatively perceived impact--60 percent of the respondents indicated that the situation was unsatisfactory. Service coordinators interviewed at every institution remarked that the current level of TEC activity could not be extended without new resources. Coordinators in most institutions doubted whether faculty members were willing to continue services even at the present level. Even though interviewed separately, coordinators made almost identical comments to the effect that while never (or very rarely) had a faculty member refused to respond to a TEC request, they were anticipating such refusals by the coming year. Questionnaire data suggested that perhaps as many as half the COE faculty members currently active in TECs may be inactive by 1979-80 (Appendix D, Table 5).

It appears that several factors combined to increase pressure on faculty resources. First, coordinators referred to the decrease in personnel which had occurred at their institutions. Between 1972-73 and 1976-77, the University of Florida dropped from 140 to 115 full-time equivalent faculty positions and Florida State University's faculty membership reportedly decreased from 253 in 1971 to 151 in 1977. Other university representatives also cited loss of faculty, though without specific numbers. The loss of faculty must be understood in relation to some basic premises about university collaboration in the state's teacher education centers.

At the time legislation was drafted (1973), it was believed (by some) that enrollment in undergraduate teacher education programs was and should be declining. As enrollment declined, it was assumed College of Education faculty would be partially available for other functions, specifically participation in inservice training through teacher education centers. However, enrollment since 1973 has actually risen in some institutions and declined only slightly in others. As a result, the loss of faculty has reportedly been greater than the relative decline in student enrollment. This was seen as a basic contradiction insofar as the move toward inservice education was related to the availability of faculty resources as a result of enrollment reductions. Moreover, it was explained that lower enrollment would not itself reshape faculty responsibilities even though it might lighten them. Faculty time could be made available only if programs were restructured.

The second factor which reportedly contributed to the increased pressure on resources was the policy that TEC work should be done onload, i.e. as part of the faculty member's assigned load. Since faculty could normally receive up to 20 percent of their salary in the form of overload payment, this practice had been applied to TEC activity. However, the 1973 legislation stated that "college or university faculty shall not be eligible for honoraria for consultant or any other services performed in programs or activities of approved teacher education centers" (F.S. 231.610:1), and by the 1977-78 service year, the principle of shifting COE resources to include inservice teacher education was interpreted as meaning that TEC activity should be performed onload with as few exceptions as possible. Most institutions attempted to increase the onload portion of their TEC service, but some found it almost impossible and continued to pay overload for half or more of the TEC services provided by their institutions. At institutions where

overload was strongly minimized, administrators reported that a breaking point seemed near. Overload payment, they said, had provided some rewards in an overall setting where TEC activity was comparatively unrewarded and more demanding than on-campus activities. The withdrawal of overload would likely mean the withdrawal of some faculty from TEC participation.

Other reasons were also given for maintaining the practice of overload payments. Some faculty members received more requests for TEC service than they could meet without leaving their on-campus duties. Some TEC requests were received after faculty assignments had been made. In general, overload was described as a safety valve which kept the system from becoming too rigid and burdensome. Questionnaire responses showed that about 60 percent of the COE faculty favored providing some and opposed providing all TEC services onload (Appendix D, Table 1).

One means of supplementing COE resources was the use of adjunct faculty. In some cases they were hired to provide services to the centers; in others, they were used to cover the on-campus loads of regular faculty while the latter were engaged in TEC work. In a few cases new faculty members were hired, but the majority of questionnaire responses indicated that TEC activity had had little or no impact on faculty hiring (Appendix E, Table 5).

Maintaining program quality on-campus and providing services through teacher education centers was identified as a problem in several interviews. A dilemma was created especially in instances where the same individuals were particularly sought by both on-campus and inservice students. If the on-campus activities were assigned to adjuncts, graduate assistants, or even other faculty, program quality reportedly suffered in the perception of students involved. Questionnaire data showed, however, that the majority of COE

respondents felt that TEC had had little impact on either graduate or undergraduate programs (Appendix D, Table 4).

Summary

Colleges of education were perceived as having broadened their mission to some extent through teacher education centers. However, a number of issues suggest that this broadening has occurred through considerable difficulty for the colleges. COE faculty reported that the strongest impacts of TEC had been increased pressure on limited resources and anxiety about the COE role in teacher education. It was suggested that the present resource situation may represent a fundamental contradiction with regard to the university role in teacher education centers.

Compared to responses for various aspects of inservice education, both college of education faculty and TEC advisory council members showed higher levels of dissatisfaction with the current situation in colleges of education as it relates to TEC.

COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS - FOCUS ON COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Collaboration between the school districts, the colleges of education, and the teaching profession is the basis of the teacher education center model in the state of Florida. While "collaboration" has been defined in a number of ways, it essentially means that the parties involved bring their separate expertise to the accomplishment of common purposes. As specified by Florida's 1973 Teacher Education Center Act, the purposes of the teacher education centers include (a) to augment present college and university teacher education programs, (b) to augment present school district inservice teacher education programs, and (c) to provide time and opportunity for preservice and inservice teachers to interact with faculty and staff of the colleges and universities and school districts in their common search for the most beneficial educational experiences for students.

The legislation also specified that (1) colleges and universities have primary responsibility for operating preservice programs, (2) the school districts have primary responsibility for operating inservice programs, and (3) the teaching profession has the responsibility for providing information to make each institution's program meaningful and relevant.

University/College - Teacher Collaboration

Data on improvement of relationships (Appendix E, Table 1) showed that the majority of advisory council members, 48 of whom were teachers, perceived that TEC had helped improve relationships between COE faculty and teachers. They rated

the present situation as satisfactory (62.8%) or very good (19.1%). COE faculty, though with less frequency than advisory council members, also perceived that relationships with teachers had been improved through TEC. It seems, however, that most university-teacher encounters occurred within the context of traditional expert/client inservice education experiences, and that there is comparatively little formalized interaction where university-TEC personnel and teachers work together for specific purposes of program improvement. University representatives do participate with teacher and other representatives on TEC advisory councils where according to regulation teachers make up the majority. However, much of the real work for program improvements is done outside the council by school district staff.

It was noted earlier that both COE faculty and advisory council members agreed that the integration between preservice and inservice programs was an area which had been little influenced by TEC and which was a source of relatively strong dissatisfaction. Opportunities for more truly collaborative relationships between COE faculty and teachers might allow teachers to influence preservice programs; however, very few advisory council members who were teachers reported having been invited to participate in any college of education activities in connection with their TEC work (Appendix E, Table 2).

University/College - School District Collaboration

University representatives and school district personnel also interact in the context of advisory council meetings, but the relationship between the school districts and colleges/universities occurs primarily through the activities of TEC directors (usually school district inservice education directors) and COE-TEC coordinators or contact persons who together formulate service agreements between a particular university and center. Directors

and university representatives also hold periodic statewide meetings which treat matters of interest or concern to the state's teacher education centers. Both directors and representatives indicated in questionnaire responses that these meetings, also regularly attended by staff from the Department of Education and the Board of Regents, were important as sources of information, communication, support, and ideas and provided a means to influence legislation and policy, consolidate the development of the centers, and increase TEC visibility throughout the state.

Both college of education faculty and advisory council member questionnaire respondents perceived that TEC had made a strong contribution to the improvement of relationships between college faculty and TEC directors and other school district staff. There were, however, some problems in university-district collaboration as experienced by COE faculty. While many interviewed were content with their individual roles through TEC, they also perceived that the university role was often more limited and passive than full collaboration would imply. The activities performed by university personnel were seen as largely restricted to the delivery of specific services, and to implementing programs developed "out in the districts."

Several questionnaire items focused on respondents' perceptions of collaboration between the colleges/universities and the teacher education centers (Appendix E, Table 3). A comparison of responses showed that advisory council members perceived a much higher degree of collaboration than did COE faculty. The majority of both COE faculty and advisory council members who perceived an imbalance of collaboration said that the TECs tended to be more dominant and benefitted more from the collaborative relationship than did the

colleges of education. Each group saw itself as sometimes viewed as less necessary.

Factors Which Inhibit Collaborative Relationships

Advisory council members were asked to consider a list of 12 possible obstacles to more effective COE-TEC collaboration (Appendix E, Table 4). (As mentioned earlier, "travel" or "distance from the COE to the district" was not included on the list. Subsequent interviews suggested this was a significant obstacle to district/COE collaboration.) Six items were marked as obstacles by more than 20 percent of the advisory council members (Appendix E, Table 5).

		Percent
1.	The lack of adequate rewards to COE faculty for TEC activity	43.8
2.	The instability of the funding process	38.2
3.	University policy/administration outside the COEs	24.7
4.	The shortage of COE resources for TEC activity	23.5
5.	Administration at the COE level	20.2
6.	The attitudes of COE faculty	20.2

From a list of 12 similar items, COE faculty indicated those which helped or hindered effective COE-TEC collaboration (Appendix E, Table 6). Only one item, the reward system at the university level, was perceived as mostly a hindrance by the majority (54.3%) of COE respondents. Other items cited as hindrances were, the funding process (41%) and university level administration/policy (38.1%).

Perceived as most helpful were departmental level administration/policy (61.0%), COE faculty skills (56.2%) and COE level administration/policy (42.9%). The item which ranked fourth as helpful was "types of service requested by the TECs" but almost an equal number of COE perceived this as much a hindrance as a help for reasons explained elsewhere in this report.

Discussion of these obstacles, helps and hindrances may be found in other sections.

Collaboration Among the Colleges of Education

A final area of collaboration to be mentioned is that between and among the various university institutions with regard to teacher education centers. It was noted above that university representatives regularly attend meetings with TEC directors. One of the functions served by these meetings has been the opportunity for university representatives to interact with each other. Several times during the 1977-78 year, meeting agenda included items specifically addressed to university concerns. In addition, university representatives held two meetings for the specific purpose of comparing notes and examining their role in inservice education through teacher education centers. Participants were unanimous in expressing the value of these meetings for increasing their understanding of the organization, practices and conditions which affected TEC activity in their respective institutions. They strongly favored the diversity which existed from institution to institution; at the same time they felt there was a need for more interinstitutional collaboration, especially in the areas of TEC-related research, evaluation, and policy development.

The majority of COE questionnaire respondents (Appendix E, Table 7) said that in their opinion, collaboration among and between the various colleges of education

was inadequate (60%). They attributed inadequate collaboration mostly to the "lack of time and personnel for interinstitutional roles."

The majority of advisory council members, asked to rate collaboration for TEC among the various colleges on a scale from "excellent" to "poor," said that it was good (28%), very good (27%), or fair (20%).

Summary

Relationships between COE faculty and teachers and district personnel were perceived as having improved as a result of collaboration through teacher education centers. Teacher education centers have focused their efforts primarily on the improvement of school district inservice education programs (more than on the improvement of university teacher education programs and the integration between preservice and inservice teacher education); collaborative relationships were perceived as most effective between school district and university personnel.

Data suggested that the school districts have benefitted more from TEC-related collaboration than have the colleges of education.

Organizational adaptations in the colleges of education and in respective COE departments and the skills of colleges of education faculty were perceived (by COE faculty) as factors which have promoted college of education collaboration in teacher education centers. The university reward system, university level (as opposed to COE level) administration and policies and the mechanisms for university funding of teacher education center activities were identified by both COE faculty and TEC advisory council members as the major obstacles to effective collaboration. Lesser obstacles perceived (by the TEC advisory council respondents) were COE level administration and the attitudes of some COE faculty.

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER SERVICE AND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY

College of education faculty members and their skills are the major resource provided to teacher education centers by the university system. This section deals with the TEC-related activities performed by those faculty and some of the ways in which service to teacher education centers has affected faculty roles.

TEC-Related Activities--The questionnaire to COE faculty asked how much time each individual gave to TEC activity[1] and what activities they had performed during 1977-78.

Of 72 respondents, 30 spent up to 10 percent of their time, 16 spent from 11 to 20 percent and 26 spent more than 20 percent (Appendix F, Table 1). Seventy-one of these respondents indicated that the basis for their assignment to TEC was--continuous from year to year (12); annual (12); quarterly (15); by request (32) (Appendix F, Table 2).

If these data were taken as representative of the TEC-involved university population, it would appear that more than 40 percent of those active in TEC participate in less than 10 percent of their time and/or only by request; less than five percent spend half or more of their time in TEC and about one-third have assignments designated for more than one quarter at a time. However, since the questionnaire was distributed to those most active in TEC at each institution, it is assumed that the general population would include even larger numbers of persons who spend a small part of their time in TEC and do so on a relatively irregular basis.

---

[1] The question did not distinguish between time spent as part of the faculty member's regular assigned load (onload) and time spent in addition to it (overload or other).

Tabulation of the kinds of TEC activities respondents had performed was made according to level of activity. Respondents who had spent up to 10 percent of their time in TEC services were categorized as less active and those who spent more than 10 percent as more active (Appendix F, Table 3).

As might be expected, those individuals who were more active in TEC work participated in a wider range of activities. When individual questionnaires were grouped according to types of activities (Appendix F, Table 4), delivery of inservice education remained the principal activity for both more and less active respondents. However, almost all of the more active respondents cited additional kinds of TEC-related activities; half the group had engaged in four or more kinds of activities; and some in as many as ten or eleven. Of the less active respondents, two-thirds had engaged in some TEC activity other than the delivery of inservice education. About half (53%) reported up to two additional kinds of activities which were spread among designing inservice materials, assessing inservice needs, evaluating inservice education, long-term school-based consultancy or in-house administration of COE-TEC activity. Only three persons reported more than three kinds of TEC-related activities and the entire range of activities indicated was six.

Examination of individual responses showed no clearcut and consistent combinations of activities, except for the fact that delivery of inservice education was performed by almost all respondents no matter what additional activities they reported.

Questionnaire responses indicated that the present situation of redistribution of faculty loads for TEC activity was perceived as unsatisfactory (53.3%) (Appendix F, Table 5). Interview data affirmed that this was a problematic area, but suggests that the problem was different for different

respondents. For some, redistribution in favor of TEC activity had not been extensive or stable enough; others saw it as having infringed on other activities. Some faculty members not currently active indicated that they were ready to become involved were there requests for their services.

A potential impact of TEC on college of education faculty might be staff development programs to facilitate redirection from preservice to inservice programs. There was however, little evidence of the existence of such programs. Half of the COE respondents said that there had been little or no impact in this area; a third felt that there had been some impact. About 47 percent said the present situation was satisfactory, but 40 percent said unsatisfactory (Appendix F, Table 5). Only six COE faculty members said that they had provided some training for TEC service to fellow faculty (Appendix F, Table 3).

The picture which emerged from the examination of amount of time spent in TEC activities and the regularity and range of the activities suggests that the university-TEC system is composed largely of short-term, high-turnover personnel with a narrow range of activities and a small core of more stable members who perform a broader range of activities.

This arrangement seemed to result from factors both inside and outside the universities. These included the nature of requests received from the TECs, and the nature of university funding for TEC.

TECs tended to request short-term and widely varied services such that larger numbers of faculty were needed occasionally and there was only limited basis for assigning individuals to more permanent TEC positions. If services were not or could not be anticipated before faculty assignments were made, universities were left to improvise as requests were formulated.

In interviews it was suggested by faculty from all institutions that an alternate and more stable university TEC situation might be created if services were long-range and developmental rather than short-term, highly specific, and often unanticipated.

In a questionnaire item, the majority of both TEC directors and college of education faculty active in TEC said that university service to TECs might be more effective if contracts were made between a TEC and a university for relatively long-term programs directed to content/skill areas and/or entire schools (Appendix F, Table 6).

Besides circumstances linked to requests from the teacher education centers, a second factor which limited TEC role stability in the universities was the nature of funding for TEC. The fact that funds were rebudgeted annually and as the service year was about to begin made definitive TEC faculty assignments impossible. Uncertainty surrounding the TEC allocation made some faculty members hesitant about assuming TEC activity as a major portion of their load. Since the TEC allocation has not been additional money, but rather resources redirected within the university budget, there has been little opportunity for development and experimentation. Furthermore, there have been pressures from budget administrators to minimize TEC spending so as not to reduce the budget for other activities.

Rewards to COE Faculty for TEC Service

According to questionnaire responses, the greater number of COE faculty felt that TEC had had little or no impact on broadening professors' roles (Appendix F, Table 5). Some, however, said that the role of COE professor was more often enhanced (40.0%) than eroded (28.6%) through TEC activity. Both opinions were expressed in interviews.

Inadequate rewards to COE faculty for TEC services was identified by questionnaire respondents as the greatest weakness in the TEC system. That there seemed to be a pattern of discrimination against persons involved in TEC activity was affirmed by coordinators and contact persons from most of the universities. However, the coordinator from one institution said that a study there had shown no correlation between salary increases and TEC activity.

COE faculty were asked in a questionnaire item to indicate the number of cases in which they felt that TEC activity had had an effect (positive or negative) on tenure, promotion and salary increases. Answers suggested (Appendix F, Table 7) that the number of persons denied tenure, promotion or salary increases was smaller than those who achieved them, even though with difficulty. The data do not indicate whether the sources of denial or difficulty lay within or outside the colleges of education, though the perceptions of COE faculty (in interviews and other questionnaire items) was that the former was more common.

More than a third of COE faculty indicated in questionnaire responses (Appendix F, Table 8) that rewards for TEC work were "staying the same" (34.3%). Some 24.8 percent said that rewards were increasing, a few said that they were decreasing, and almost 30 percent said that they did not know. There were no differences in the perception of reward changes according to the respondent's degree of involvement in TEC.

A relevant question is whether inadequate rewards for TEC might coincide with inadequate rewards to colleges of education or even to university faculty in general. In conversations with COE personnel, a comment which recurred with notable frequency characterized the colleges of education as the "stepchildren" of the university system. During

field visits made in the spring of 1976 a teacher education program review team observed that budget resources allocated to the colleges of education were often less than expected by the number of students served by the colleges. Such a situation would conceivably limit the resources available for promotion, tenure and salary increases. The report noted the loss of quality faculty in the colleges of education and specifically recommended that:

> ...every effort be made to retain well-qualified faculty through the mechanisms of better salaries, research support, and a reward system for performing community service through such activities as teacher education centers . . .If the SUS values inservice training and the work which is conducted out in the field as opposed to research and publication efforts, the reward system must reflect that value.

COE Faculty Attitudes

One fifth of the advisory council members cited "the attitudes of COE faculty" among the obstacles to COE-TEC collaboration (Appendix E, Table 4). More than a third of COE respondents indicated that faculty attitudes were as much a hindrance as a help to more effective collaboration (Appendix E, Table 6).

Non-COE sources were not interviewed on this item, but other questionnaire responses may be related. More than one-third of the advisory council respondents felt that only some or a few COE faculty from whom they had received services seemed interested in learning as well as teaching; more than one-fourth said that services offered tended to reflect professors' expertise rather than teachers' needs. A breakdown of the response on COE faculty attitudes showed that this was cited as an obstacle by TEC directors more frequently than by teachers or other administrators (Appendix E, Table 5). This implies that difficulties were felt at the organizational level rather than in the context of services provided.

Interview data suggest that COE faculty concern about faculty attitudes as a hindrance to TEC collaboration reflected two different circumstances. Some faculty members felt some colleagues were individualistic and unaccustomed to or uninterested in collaboration among themselves as well as with groups outside the institution. Secondly, there were those who felt that because of pressures and lack of rewards associated with TEC activity, some faculty members were developing negative attitudes about TEC involvement.

Summary

As a result of internal and external factors college of education service to teacher education centers is provided through the organization of specialized personnel with a rapid turnover and a narrow range of activities alongside a core of more stable personnel who perform a broader range of activities. There is some indication that a longer term, lower turnover, wider activity range system might be more satisfactory to college of education faculty and more beneficial to teacher education centers. However, such an arrangement would require an adequate reward structure which is generally perceived as not presently existing in the university system.

SUMMARY, ISSUES, AND IMPLICATIONS

Generalizations about the university role in teacher education centers do not come easy. Research has demonstrated that after four years of operation, opinions are mixed and structural adaptations are varied. It is clear that universities, almost entirely through the colleges of education, have contributed substantially to the improvement of inservice education. However, several factors have combined to limit both that contribution and the potential role of colleges of education in Florida's teacher education centers.

A Contribution Has Been Made

By 1977-78, the colleges of education were providing an average of 80 percent of the services offered through teacher education centers. At the time, centers included roughly two-thirds of the school districts and one-third of the instructional personnel in the state.

Is inservice education in Florida better because of teacher education centers? The consensus at a meeting of university TEC representatives was, "Yes, it's better--but what have we got to prove it?" Perhaps the only "data" available are the intuitive statements of those involved in TEC processes. The majority of persons surveyed in this research--89 from teacher education center advisory councils and 105 from colleges of education--answered that teacher education centers (and by inference colleges of education) had made an important contribution to improvements in the organization, content, and amount of inservice education, and in the relationships among teachers, school district personnel, and college of education faculty.

Council members and college faculty also reported that through teacher education centers, the colleges of education have broadened their professional mission, a goal which virtually all COE respondents held as desirable. Faculty members interviewed gave strong, though not uncritical support to involvement in teacher education centers.

The role in teacher education centers has also produced structural adaptations in the colleges of education. Teacher education centers have been the primary vehicle through which colleges of education have responded to the state mandate to shift from exlusive concern with preservice teacher education to include an emphasis on inservice education. The degree of involvement in TEC and the degree of structural adaptation differ from college to college. However, all have a budget especially marked for teacher education center service, a designated person and office to coordinate TEC service, appointed representatives to serve on TEC advisory councils and faculty members assigned to TEC activity. All have adapted their programs to accommodate TEC activity.

Accompanying COE contributions and organizational changes are certain pressures and limitations which have restricted the development of the COE role in teacher education centers. Research suggests that these stem from:

(1) the focus on inservice education

(2) weaknesses in collaborative relationships

(3) lack of TEC program development in the universities

(4) policy instability

(5) shortage of resources

(6) the larger university system

(7) the tenuous development of university organization for TEC activity

Focus on Inservice Education

Florida's Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 stated three major purposes for centers: a) to augment present college and university teacher education programs, b) to augment present school district inservice teacher education programs, c) to provide time and opportunity for preservice and inservice teachers to interact with faculty and staff of the colleges and universities and school districts in their common search for the most beneficial educational experiences for students. Until now TECs in the state have been almost solely preoccupied with inservice education. Consequently, college of education resources have been used to supplement district resources and carry out district programs. On the one hand, this has meant a broadening of the COE mission; on the other, COE faculty said that anxieties about the COE role in teacher education have been created. The failure of TEC to contribute to the improvement of preservice programs was noted by the majority of both COE faculty and TEC advisory council members surveyed.

Weaknesses in Collaborative Relationships

The TEC model in Florida is based on collaboration among school districts, teacher organizations and universities. In practice, however, the university role in TEC is activated by a request procedure which originates in the school districts. University personnel seldom participate in the needs assessment and program planning which shape the requests, but are merely asked to respond to them. Even though requests are often based on faculty skills, the university role remains fairly passive.

Individual faculty member opinions differ widely on this issue. Some feel they only have time for the actual delivery of particular services.

Others insist that such a system restricts a fuller COE contribution and is not truly collaborative. Many COE faculty and TEC advisory council members surveyed felt that "collaboration" did not always characterize university-TEC activities and that TECs tended to dominate relationships and receive more benefits.

Other data showed that universities made limited efforts to involve TECs in collaborative program development. The survey of TEC advisory council members showed that about one-fourth of them (mostly TEC directors) had been invited to participate in college of education activities through TEC, but as these activities were described, only two or three were of a type which might have influenced program development. On specific questionnaire items, advisory council members more often said that some COE faculty (rather than most or many) were able collaborators in TEC matters and were interested in learning as well as teaching. More than one-fourth said that COE services reflected professor's expertise more than teachers' needs. Both TEC advisory council members and COE faculty indicated some concern over faculty attitudes as an obstacle to collaboration.

While the prevailing opinion is that teacher education centers have improved relationships among the various entities involved, some notable weaknesses in collaboration still remain.

Lack of TEC Program Development in the Universities

Since universities are primarily in a position of responding to requests, there has been little opportunity to develop integrated programs which make the best all-around use of university resources. Longer-term, multi-phased and multifaceted services from university faculty have been overshadowed by

"one-shot," highly condensed and fragmented inservice activities. Both COE faculty and TEC directors surveyed indicated a preference for a more strategic use of university resources.

The foregoing programmatic factors--focus on inservice education, weaknesses in collaborative relationships, and lack of program TEC development in the universities--are closely linked with the following structural factors in causing the limitations and pressures which surround the university role in teacher education centers.

Policy Instability

State guidelines for funding university TEC services and procedures for accounting and reporting them have been repeatedly altered since the beginning of TEC in Florida, creating an instability that has hindered the institutionalization of the university role in TEC. University TEC administrators have had to be improvisors and jacks of all trades. Faculty members have been skeptical of commitment to TEC activity--just another "fad" or "bandwagon" in education.

Not only have policies changed frequently, but often without input from those expected to apply or adhere to them. Consequently, changes were not only changes; they were surprises as well and the destabilizing effect was even more intense.

Shortage of Resources

It is clear in various documents that no new money would be allocated to the universities but that TEC activity would be supported by shifting resources from undergraduate programs. The assumption seems to have been that resources would be available because of anticipated declines in

enrollments. What actually happened has created a contradiction. Undergraduate enrollments fell less quickly than expected and not at all or only slightly in some institutions. Meanwhile, vacated faculty positions were not filled and the relative decline in faculty exceeded that of students. As a result, much TEC service has been supplied, not through a shift in resources, but by more intensive use of existing resources and by spreading TEC responsibilities thinly over a large number of faculty.

The Larger University System

In the majority of Florida's nine state universities, key administrators have often been cool, if not opposed to teacher education centers, and university level administration and policy is seen by COE faculty as a hindrance to a better TEC system. For example, some academic vice presidents opposed including TEC activity as a formal part of their institutions' missions. They especially objected to the earmarking of institutional resources by the legislature and the Board of Regents. College of education deans tended to object to the ways and costs with which TEC had been implemented. Where higher administration support for TEC has been weak, structural adaptations and institutional involvement in TEC reflect compliance with the law rather than commitment to goals.

Lack of support within the university is further evidenced in the professional reward system. Both COE faculty and TEC advisory council members identified inadequate rewards to faculty for TEC service as the major weakness in the TEC system. COE faculty specified that while the reward system was also a problem in the colleges of education, it was more pronounced at other levels of the university system. The question should be raised, however,

whether rewards for TEC work are inadequate in comparison with other faculty activities or with activities in other university colleges, or with the extra demands of TEC work itself. COE faculty surveyed said TEC activity was less rewarded than research, on-campus teaching and governance, but they also cited more instances where TEC activity was a help than a hindrance in the achievement of promotion, tenure, or salary increases. Another common perception was that compared to other colleges, colleges of education do not fare well in the general distribution of university resources, including faculty rewards. No attempt was made to verify this perception. Finally, a number of faculty interviewed said that additional planning and travel time, along with unfamiliar settings and procedures made TEC service more difficult than other faculty activities, especially when the regular faculty load was not adequately reduced to provide the time necessary for TEC and when overload payment was not received.

Whatever the basis of the inadequacy of rewards for TEC service, adequate rewards are essential to the firm development of new roles. Human beings and human organizations are induced to change either by coercion (including the need for survival) or by reward. Where change is induced by coercion, adaptation is likely to be minimal, unwilling and unstable; results are apt to be limited. Vital and effective change requires adequate rewards.

Tenuous Development of University Organization for TEC

Since organizational effectiveness is measured by the ability of the organization to reach its goals, both task and maintenance, it follows that university organization for TEC is effective to the degree that it facilitates progress toward the realization of TEC purposes while also benefitting participants.

Consideration of the factors already mentioned suggests that they have converged to inhibit the emergence of effective university organization for TEC activity.

That positive contributions have been made is a fact which if not recognized distorts the true picture. Nevertheless, signs of lacking effectiveness in the task area include: 1) little progress in the area of preservice programs, and 2) preoccupation with definitions, policies, and conditions which relate to university involvement in TEC. In the maintenance area signs are: 1) relative dissatisfaction with various aspects of the university TEC system such as rewards for service, faculty load assignments, mechanisms for delivering off-campus services, university and college of education administration, and 2) anticipated decline in the number of COE faculty willing to participate in TEC.

Towards a More Effective University Organization for Teacher Education Centers

New organizations do not develop quickly, especially when they are built from previously existing institutions with established norms and structures. Perhaps the most valuable contribution of TEC in Florida has been the opportunity to experience and discover both the benefits and the difficulties of TEC collaboration. More than three-fourths of the faculty surveyed believe the potential contribution of universities to TEC is high or very high. At the same time research suggests that a re-examination of the university role in teacher education centers is needed if this potential is to be realized. Adjustments are called for by the present situation and for the future. University resources are already greatly pressed and organizational changes inadequate, yet the number of instructional personnel

served by teacher education centers is expected to triple within the next year as the 1979 deadline for implementation of centers approaches.

Explorations made in this research suggest that university personnel involved in TEC service and administration advocate two things: 1) the collaborative development of teacher education center plans and programs, and 2) the opportunity to create more effective and satisfactory faculty TEC roles.

The Collaborative Development of a TEC Plan and Program

After four years of experience, local universities as well as school districts and the teaching profession, are in a position to assess original goals in the light of their own realities, to define and clarify their respective needs and abilities, and to negotiate programs to which all partners subscribe in mutually understood ways. While plans and their programs for realization should vary according to local conditions, from the standpoint of the universities, there are some common interests:

(1) an emphasis on the integration of preservice and inservice teacher education programs

(2) more participation by COE faculty in needs assessment, planning, and evaluation of inservice programs

(3) more initiative in the development of an institutional program compatible with collaboratively designed programs

(4) more utilization of teacher and school district resources in university programs

(5) more collaboration among university institutions.

More Effective and Satisfactory Faculty TEC Roles

The present university organization for TEC depends largely on improvisation and good will in an atmosphere of limited resources and redoubled pressure. Frequently, faculty are involved only in providing specific

inservice components and are unfamiliar with TEC operations in their own colleges. Some have stated the need for better internal communications and for more stable TEC roles with a wider range of activities. University TEC roles must be designed with sufficient stability to achieve both program effectiveness and professional satisfaction and with sufficient flexibility to respond to the settings and needs characteristic of school districts throughout the state.

TEC administrators and faculty in different colleges of education suggested more effective organization might function along the lines of a department or program area, according to the structural features of particular university institutions. The advantages of such arrangements would include increased autonomy for program development and administration, and increased visibility and communication vis-a-vis other organisms within and without the universities. Finally, the institutionalization of TEC roles would help consolidate TEC goals as part of the university mission and lessen anxieties about the role of universities in teacher education centers.

Before such institutionalization can take place, policies and resources must be adequate enough to encourage and sustain the development of faculty TEC roles. Budgets need to be sufficient, dependable, and free from manipulation by other university interests. Rewards must be at least comparable with those for other faculty activities. Contrary to the present pattern, budgets and policies should be determined on the basis of programs rather than vice versa.

There is a sense of pride over what has been accomplished in four short years, with so few resources. Along with the difficulties encountered have come experience and indications for new directions. If political realities indeed support collaboration in teacher education programs, there is a great deal of promise for the continued development of an effective university role in Florida's teacher education centers.

A CONCEPTUAL NOTE

Teacher education center activity is conceptualized as a service function by some university faculty and as an instructional function by others. Had this difference been perceived earlier in the research,[1] it could have been explored more carefully. A few notes, however, can be made.

Those who conceptualized TEC activity as a service function, emphasize that the university has a three-way mission--research, instruction, and service--though service has not traditionally figured nor been rewarded on a par with the other two functions. Further, this lack of rewards stems from the fact that service is considered as an "extra" or "good guy" activity. In order to improve the position of service as part of the overall mission, some COE faculty suggest that a certain level (for instance 25 percent) of college resources and/or faculty loads be directed to service functions.

Other faculty members, also concerned that TEC activity receives inadequate recognition, believe that it should be classified as instruction, though with new clients and in new settings. They point out that any distinction between teaching and service which is based on the on-campus/off-campus criterion is inaccurate since universities operate increasingly in extension centers, especially in highly urbanized areas. Further, even though TEC activity is carried out on a non-credit basis, it is clearly directed to the preparation of professionals.

[1]The author was initially acquainted with TEC activity through persons who conceptualized it as a service function and this assumption pertained at the time questionnaire instruments were developed and most personal interviews were conducted.

A NOTE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

One research concern has been to determine the university/college of education input into the formation of the Teacher Education Center Act of 1973.

Several individuals reported that for some time prior to the passage of the law, they had studied and promoted the idea of teacher education centers. Some college deans had directed the attention of legislators to TEC development in other states, including onsite visits, and advocated that Florida adopt a university-school district collaboration based on the preparation of teacher interns. One university had already formed a relationship with a nearby school district and used the term teacher education center to refer to the operation. However, the remarkably consistent response of university administrators and faculty interviewed was that the 1973 law came as a complete surprise in both its timing and its content.

Interviews did not establish the actual process associated with the formulation of the law nor the reasons for the style of its promulgation. One effect, however, was the initial alienation of some members of the university community, especially administrators, toward TEC policies. A common interpretation which developed among COE personnel was that TEC involvement was a matter of survival for their colleges or for faculty positions. While research showed that professors engaged in TEC desired to do so, this did not assuage the feeling that legislative processes themselves had not been collaborative.

APPENDIX A

Some excerpts from the Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 (as amended) which pertain to the role of universities through teacher education centers.

> . . . teacher education is best carried out through the collaborative efforts of the colleges and universities, the schools, and the community. (Florida Statutes, Section 231.601:3).
>
> . . . the responsibility for operating programs for preservice and inservice teacher education is assigned jointly to the colleges and universities, to the district school boards, and to the teaching profession, with the colleges and universities having primary responsibility for operating preservice programs, the school districts having primary responsibility for operating inservice programs, and the teaching profession having the responsibility for providing information to make each institution's program meaningful and relevant . . . . (Ibid, Section 231.601:4)
>
> Each teacher center shall be planned, financed and staffed jointly by one or more colleges or universities. Community colleges may participate in the appropriate phases of teacher education center activities. (Ibid, Section 231.603:1)
>
> Funding. Teacher education centers shall be funded jointly by participating school districts and colleges and universities, the department of education, federal or private grants and donations, fees, and funds from any other appropriate source . . . Colleges and Universities. Each college and university, public or private, participating in an approved teacher education center, shall allocate for the approved college or university activities carried out in the teacher education center full-time equivalency faculty time and other appropriate resources equal to the allocation for the same type of activities carried out in on-campus programs. (Ibid, Sections 231.609:1 and 231.609:3)
>
> Board of Regents. The duties and responsibilities of the board of regents shall be to adopt, or cause to be adopted, policies and procedures necessary to accomplish the following:
>
> (a) Full-time equivalency faculty and non-faculty positions equal to the student credit hours, undergraduate or graduate, earned by individuals participating in activities of teacher education centers established pursuant to this act shall be allocated to the activities of the centers where generated.
>
> (b) All appropriate faculty professional activities and services, in addition to student contact hours teaching performed in school districts to effectuate the purposes and intent of this act, shall be

recognized on the same basis as all other activities or services recognized for faculty rewards, including salary and promotions, and for allocating faculty time for research, counseling, and all other nonteaching services. (Ibid, Section 231.609:2, a,b)

Colleges and Universities. Each college and university, public or private, participating in an approved teacher education center, shall allocate for the approved college or university activities carried out in the teacher education center full-time equivalency faculty time and other appropriate resources equal to the allocation for the same type of activities carried. (Ibid, Section 231.609:3)

All noncredit student contact hours of instruction by faculty of the state university system in teacher education center activities conducted in school districts shall be computed for state appropriation purposes at the same rate as those for upper division credit hours. College or university faculty shall not be eligible for honoraria for consultant or any other services performed in programs or activities of approved teacher education centers. (Ibid, Section 231.610:1)

From the amount appropriated annually by the appropriations act to the general office of the board of regents, the board shall allocate an amount in the manner indicated therein to colleges of education in the state university system for the support of noncredit activities carried out in teacher education centers approved by the department of education which meet the criteria adopted specifically for this purpose by the state board of education pursuant to Section 231.601(4) and 231.603, Florida Statutes. Funds referred to in this section shall not be spent for any activity other than the direct support of noncredit activities carried out under the direction of an approved teacher education center. (Ibid, Section 231.610:3)

APPENDIX B

Table 1. Mean Figures of Six Variables for Five School District Groupings in the State of Florida.

	District Groupings				
	1	2	3	4	5
Percent urban	86.4	67.3	42.5	31.1	5.7
Percent rural	13.6	32.7	57.5	68.9	94.3
Percent white collar workers	54.4	47.6	41.2	35.9	30.9
Median family income	$8,857	7,663	6,528	6,286	5,683
Median years schooling	12.3	12.1	11.5	10.2	9.3
Inservice education/training	$470,327	127,258	63,734	24,150	14,966

Source: Arranged by author from data contained in Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1976-77, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida. (The figures for population variables are based on 1970 census data. The inservice education/training budget is that reported for 1976-77.

Table 2. Distribution of Counties, Instructional Personnel and Pupil Membership According to District Grouping.

	District Grouping					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of counties	11	13	10	17	16	67
Percent	16.4	19.4	14.9	15.4	13.9	100.0
Instructional personnel	53,410	17,587	6,173	4,506	2,630	83,014
Percent	64.3	21.2	7.4	5.4	1.6	100.0
Pupil membership	965,989	320,695	123,187	79,131	46,758	1,535,760
Percent	62.9	20.9	8.0	5.2	3.0	100.0

Source: Ibid.

Table 3. Teacher Education Center School Districts by Year of Entrance into TEC and District Grouping.

Year	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
1973-74	Alachua Leon Sarasota	Bay Okaloosa Polk Indian River[1] Charlotte[2] Lee[2]	Osceola St. Lucie[1] Martin[1]	Franklin[3] Gulf[3] Jackson[3] Washington[3] De Soto[2] Hendry[2]	Calhoun[3] Holmes[3] Liberty[3] Glades[2]
1975	Pinellas		Highlands[4]	Hernando Walton Okeechobee[4]	Hardee[4]
1976		Clay Manatee		Baker Nassau	Union
1977		Collier* Seminole	Columbia[5] St. Johns[5] Putnam[5]	Bradford[5] Flagler[5]	Madison
April, 1978					Hamilton Dixie[6] Gilchrist[6] Lafayette[6]
TOTAL	4	10	6	14	11

[1]Mideast [2]Southwest [3]PAEC [4]Tri-County [5]Northeast [6]DGL *Separated from Southeast Consortium

Table 3a. Distribution of School Districts in TEC by District Grouping, 1974-75 and 1977-78.

	District Groupings					TOTAL	
	1	2	3	4	5	%	No.
TEC Counties 1974-75	13.6	17.3	13.6	27.3	18.2	100.00	(22)
TEC Counties 1977-78	8.9	22.2	13.3	31.1	24.4	100.00	(45)

Table 4. TEC Counties and Instructional Personnel in Relation to District Groups.

	District Groupings					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
TEC Counties	4	10	6	14	11	45
Percent all counties in grouping	36.7	76.9	60.0	82.3	68.7	67.8
Instructional personnel in TEC counties	9,066	12,549	2,785	3,647	1,292	29,339
Percent total instructional personnel in grouping	17.0	71.4	45.1	80.9	49.1	35.3

Table 5. Percent (Estimate)* of Services Obtained by 15 TECs in 1977-78 by Source of Service (State University System, private institutions, non-higher education sources).

TEC	SUS%	Private IHE %	Non-IHE %
Alachua	95	2	3
Bay	95	2	3
Clay	90		5
Hernando	95		5
Leon	65	2	33
Madison	60		40
Manatee	50		50
Mideast (3)	90		
Nassau	90	5	5
Northeast (4)	90	2	8
Osceola	90		
Polk	60	35	5
Southwest (5)	52	2	46
Tri-County (3)	70	15	15
Union	100		
Average for 15 centers (26 counties)	79.5	4.5	14.5

*These figures were reported by TEC Directors in a questionnaire item.

Table 6. Estimated* SUS/TEC Service Days for 1977-78
By District Grouping

	Number of Days	% Total
Group 1	761	18.6
Group 2	1,690	41.4
Group 3	555	13.6
Group 4	829	20.4
Group 5	246	6.0
TOTAL	4,081	100.0

* Based on SUS estimates made in August, 1977, some 4,081 service days were projected for 1977-78. Figures used exclude 400 days projected for Broward County which did not establish a TEC during 1977-78. Because data is recorded by TEC and some multi-county TECs crosscut district groupings, an accurate summary of service days by grouping is difficult. The above estimate was made by dividing service days among consortium members on the basis of the ratio of the county's instructional personnel to the consortium as a whole.

Table 7. TEC Service Allocations (in days) for 1977-78 by University Providing Services and TEC Requesting Services.

University	TEC Days Allocated 1977-78	% SUS Total	TEC	No. Days Requested	Percent Total Services
FAMU	149	3.3	Bay	24	5
			Leon	75	10
			PAEC Consortium	50	n.d.
FAU	543	10.4	Mideast Consortium	200	85
			Collier	38	n.d.
			Southwest Consortium	75	13
			Tri-County Consortium	30	21
			Broward*	200	n.d.
FIU	350	6.5	Collier	50	n.d.
			Southwest Consortium	100	17
			Broward*	200	n.d.
FSU	629	17.7	Bay	143	28
			Hernando	10	7
			Leon	200	55
			Madison	50	n.d.
			Mideast Consortium	6	1
			PAEC Consortium	220	n.d.
FTU	449	9.4	Osecola	275	95
			Mideast Consortium	10	2
			Seminole	164	n.d.
UF	276		Alachua	656**	95
			Hernando	10	7
			Mideast Consortium	10	2
			Tri-County Consortium	20	1
			Hamilton	20	n.d.

* Broward County did not operate a TEC in 1977-78.

** Alachua County did not receive the amount of services requested for 1977-78.

Table 7, Continued.

University	TEC Days Allocated 1977-78	% SUS Total	TEC	No. Days Requested	Percent Total Services
University of North Florida	304	4.1	Baker	20	90
			Clay	75	90
			Nassau	42	95
			Union	20	85
			Northeast Consortium	147	90
University of South Florida	1,098	24.7	Collier	70	n.d.
			Hernando	120	88
			Manatee	100	50
			Pinellas	200	35
			Polk	310	60
			Sarasota	70	n.d.
			Southwest Consortium	128	22
			Tri-County Consortium	100	42
University of West Florida	683	17.1	Bay	85	60
			Okaloosa	328	n.d.
			Walton	150	n.d.
			PAEC Consortium	120	n.d.
TOTAL	4,481	100.0			

Sources: 1) A Plan for 1978-79 Fiscal Year...

2) "Contact Days for Service Requested from State Universities" distributed at October, 1977 meeting of TEC directors and university representatives

3) Questionnaire DIRECTORS April, 1978

Table 1. Advisory Council Members (TEC) and College of Education (COE) Faculty Perceptions of the Contribution of TEC Activity and the Present Situation with Respect to Improvements in the Delivery, Content, Amount of Inservice Education and Integration with Preservice Education; (TEC, N=89, COE, N=105)

Item	Respondent Group	TEC Contribution			Present Situation		
		Great	Some	Little/ None	Very Good	Satis- factory	Unsatis- factory
Delivery	TEC	65.2	27.0	6.7	33.7	62.9	2.2
	COE	30.5	51.4	7.6	7.6	56.2	25.7
Content	TEC	49.4	42.7	6.7	30.3	61.8	6.7
	COE	22.9	54.3	12.4	8.6	60.0	21.0
Amount	TEC	48.3	37.1	11.2	31.5	58.4	6.7
	COE	38.1	41.3	8.6	9.5	59.0	20.0
Integration With Pre- service	TEC	20.1	34.8	36.0	14.6	42.7	33.7
	COE	9.5	31.4	47.6	4.8	38.1	45.7

TABLE 2. Adv sory Council Members (TEC) and College of Education (COE) Faculty Perceptions of The Impact of TEC Activity and the Present Situation in the Colleges of Education with Respect to (Item) (Relative figures; TEC N=89; COE N=105)

ITEM	RESPONDENT GROUP	IMPACT ON TEC ACTIVITY			THE PRESENT SITUATION		
		GREAT	SOME	NONE/ LITTLE	VERY GOOD	SATIS- FACTORY	UNSATIS- FACTORY
1. Development of mechanisms for delivering off-campus service	TEC	18.0	39.3	22.5	20.2	37.1	22.5
	COE	28.6	48.6	12.4	10.5	53.3	25.7
2. Integration between inservice and preservice programs	TEC	7.9	24.7	44.9	5.6	29.2	42.7
	COE	3.8	37.1	49.5	1.0	41.0	48.6

Table 3. Satisfaction with the Way the COE/TEC System Currently Functions (Relative figures; COE N = 105)

	Yes	More Yes Than No	More No Than Yes	No	Don't Know
Total	5.7	39.0	16.2	17.1	20.0
Not Active	0.0	36.4	9.1	15.2	33.3
1-10% TEC	6.7	20.0	23.3	30.0	20.0
11%+ TEC	9.5	54.8	16.7	9.5	9.5

Table 4. The Contribution of TEC's in Florida and the Present Situation with Respect to the Improvement in Relationships Between Teachers and Other Teachers, Administrators, Students and Parents (Relative Figures; TEC: N = 89, COE: N = 105)

		TECS HAVE CONTRIBUTED			THE PRESENT SITUATION IS		
	RESPONSE GROUP	GREAT DEAL	SOME	NONE/LITTLE	VERY GOOD	SATISF.	UNSATISF.
Among teachers in the same school	TEC	14.6	50.5	24.7	12.3	66.3	11.2
	COE	12.4	47.6	15.2			
Among teachers across schools	TEC	20.2	53.9	16.9	11.2	65.2	14.6
	COE	13.4	42.8	16.2			
Between teachers and administrators	TEC	10.1	59.5	21.4	5.6	71.9	5.6
	COE	6.7	42.9	21.9			
Between teachers and students	TEC	10.1	52.8	24.7	11.2	70.8	5.6
	COE	8.6	44.8	19.0			
Between teachers and parents	TEC	1.1	33.7	48.2	3.3	60.6	19.1
	COE	3.9	23.8	40.9			

Table 5. Questionnaire Item: Are the colleges of education currently providing your TEC with the kinds of services most needed in the inservice education of teachers? (Check as many as apply) (N = 89)

	%
COEs provide services better than any other source	56.2
Most needed services are usually obtained from other sources: COE services tend to meet secondary needs	7.9
Services offered by COEs reflect professors' expertise rather than teachers' needs	28.1
COES are not currently providing the services that they might and which TECs would like to have	20.2

Table 6. Questionnaire Item: How would you rate the quality of the services provided by the instutition of higher education with which your TEC works most frequently? (Relative figures)

	N	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Total	89	21.3	40.4	25.8	7.9	0.0
Teachers	55	20.0	38.2	27.3	9.1	0.0
TEC Directors	18	38.9	33.3	27.8	0.0	0.0
Others	16	6.3	56.3	18.8	12.5	0.0

Table 7. Questionnaire item: Are you generally satisfied with the amount of service available to your TEC through the various institutions of higher education? (Relative figures)

	N	In General, Yes	In General, No	Yes and No
Total	89	70.8	10.1	14.6
Teachers	55	65.5	9.1	20.0
TEC Directors	18	88.8	5.6	5.6
Others	16	68.8	18.8	6.3

Problem of shortage. More services are needed----------29.2

Problem of oversupply. Sometimes service is used because it is available more readily than from other sources----------18.0

Table 8. Questionnaire Item: Do the following statements apply to the college of education personnel who have provided services through your TEC? (Relative figures; N = 89)

	Applies To Most	Applies To Many	Applies To Some	Applies To Few/None
They have a good sense of classroom/teacher inservice needs	30.3	25.8	29.2	4.5
They are strongly committed to providing good inservice training	31.5	28.1	27.0	3.4
They are able collaborators in TEC matters	24.7	24.7	31.5	7.9
They are interested in learning as well as teaching	25.8	24.7	29.2	9.0
They are hindered by the institutions from being as effective as they might in TEC service	10.1	13.5	37.1	23.6
They provide TEC service reluctantly	1.1	7.9	38.2	34.8
They are too removed from the real classroom/teacher world	12.4	15.7	41.6	21.3
They could profit from a planned staff development program for COE-TEC faculty	22.5	30.3	30.3	2.2

Table 9. Questionnaire Item:
Do University Representatives Collaborate in the Assessment of Inservice Needs, Planning and Evaluation of Inservice Education Offered Through Your TEC?
(Relative figures; N = 89)

FUNCTION	USUALLY/OFTEN	SOMETIMES	NO	SUFFICIENTLY	INSUFFICIENTLY	THROUGH COUNCIL	SERVICE CONTEXT	BOTH EQUALLY
Needs Assessment	48.3	34.8	5.6	67.4	16.9	42.7	21.3	25.8
Planning Inservice Education	54.0	28.1	6.7	61.8	16.9	30.3	37.1	18.0
Evaluation Inservice Education	33.7	37.1	13.5	46.1	22.5	33.7	29.2	9.0

APPENDIX D

Table 1. Questionnaire Item: Are you in agreement with the trend to... (Relative figures; COE: N = 105)

		YES	NO	MIXED
Involve COEs in inservice teacher education				
	Total	96.2	0.0	3.8
	Not Active	100.0	0.0	0.0
	1-10% Active	96.7	0.0	3.3
	11+% Active	92.9	0.0	7.1
Expand the off-campus clientele base of COEs				
	Total	78.1	2.9	18.1
	Not Active	78.8	3.0	15.2
	1-10% Active	73.3	3.3	23.3
	11+% Active	81.0	2.4	16.7
Require COEs to provide some inservice education as part of assigned faculty load				
	Total	61.9	11.4	19.0
	Not Active	51.5	18.2	15.2
	1-10% Active	56.7	13.3	23.3
	11+% Active	73.8	4.8	19.0
Require COEs to provide all inservice education as part of assigned faculty load				
	Total	8.6	61.0	12.4
	Not Active	18.2	57.6	15.2
	1-10% Active	3.3	70.0	6.7
	11+% Active	4.8	57.1	14.3
Reduce undergraduate teacher education enrollment				
	Total	24.8	43.8	30.5
	Not Active	30.3	45.5	21.2
	1-10% Active	10.0	56.7	33.3
	11+% Active	31.0	33.3	35.7

Table 2. How Do You Rate the Potential Contribution of Your COE to the TECs it Serves?

	N	Very High	High	Average	Low	Don't Know
Total	105	39.0	36.2	9.5	0.0	13.3
Not Active	33	33.3	30.3	18.2	0.0	15.2
1-10% TEC	30	50.0	33.3	3.3	0.0	13.3
11%+ TEC	42	35.7	42.9	7.1	0.0	11.9

Table 3. To What Would You Attribute Your involvement in TEC Activity? Present (N = 72); Future (N = 33)

Item	% Respondents Who Checked Item (N = 72)	(N = 33)	% Respondents Who Ranked Item 1,2 (N = 72)	(N = 33)
Requests for your services	81.9	81.8	48.6	54.5
Desire to participate in inservice teacher education	73.6	42.4	37.5	24.3
Assignment by your department or by COE administration	50.0	51.5	9.7	24.2
Encouragement from other colleagues	19.4	6.1	2.7	0.0
Pressure caused by shift in COE resources	13.9	30.3	6.9	18.2
Change in present reward system to include TEC activity		31.2		18.2

Table 4. Impact of TEC on Colleges of Education and Present Situation with Respect to Pressure on Resources and COE Mission (Relative figures; TEC, N = 89; COE, N = 105)

ITEM	RESPONDENT GROUP	IMPACT OF TEC ACTIVITY			THE PRESENT SITUATION		
		GREAT	SOME	NONE LITTLE	VERY GOOD	SATIS-FACTORY	UNSATIS-FACTORY
Greater pressure placed on already limited resources	TEC	18.0	33.7	16.9	3.4	34.8	30.3
	COE	48.6	33.3	10.5	1.9	30.2	60.0
Mission of the COEs							
Development of wider role for COE in general	TEC	10.1	42.7	21.3	3.4	50.6	20.2
	COE	19.0	55.2	16.2	11.4	49.5	29.5
Creating anxiety about COE role in teacher education	COE	28.6	41.9	21.9	3.8	52.4	36.2
On Campus Programs							
Undermining the preservice program	COE	5.7	26.7	57.1	6.7	63.9	19.0
Undermining the graduate program	COE	4.8	31.4	53.3	9.5	56.2	23.8

Table 5. What Percent (%) of Your Time Did/Do/Will You Spend in TEC Activity and Public Service in 1975-76, 1977-78, 1979-80? (N = 105)

	1975-76	1977-78	1979-80
TEC Activity	45 (43.8%)	72 (68.6%)	39 (37.1%)
1-10% Active	27	30	10
11-20% Active	6	16	9
21-30% Active	5	12	7
31+% Active	7	14	13
Public Service	62 (59.0%)	60 (65.7%)	46 (43.8%)
1-10% Active	40	43	27
11-20% Active	15	16	10
21-30% Active	2	5	4
31+% Active	5	5	5

APPENDIX E

Table 1. The Contribution of TEC and the Present Situation with Respect to the Improvement in Relationships Between Collaborative Groups (Relative figures; TEC N = 89, COE N = 105)

	Response Group	TECs Have Contributed			The Present Situation is		
		Great Deal	Some	None/Little	Very Good	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory
Between TEC directors and COE faculty	TEC	41.6	34.7	5.6	24.7	52.8	4.5
Between teachers and COE faculty	TEC	33.7	49.4	6.7	19.1	62.8	7.9
	COE	23.8	48.6	6.7			
Between TEC directors and other school district staff	TEC	31.4	45.0	8.9	25.8	58.4	0.0
	COE	26.7	31.5	8.6			
Between teachers and school district staff	TEC	20.2	53.9	14.6	7.8	69.7	11.2
	COE	7.7	44.8	17.2			

Table 2. Questionnaire Item: Have you been asked to participate in any college of education activities (committees, studies, seminars, etc.) as a result of your TEC work?

	N	Number Responding "Yes"
Teachers	55	10
TEC Directors	18	11
Others	16	3
TOTAL	89	24

Table 3. COE-TEC Collaboration.

		Always	Usually	Sometimes	No	Don't Know[1]
Is the relationship one of equal partners?	TEC	24.7	46.1	14.6	9.0	--
	COE	5.5	45.8	16.7	9.7	16.7
Do both components benefit equally?	TEC	10.1	57.3	14.6	6.7	--
	COE	6.9	40.2	13.8	18.0	13.9
Does each component view the other as necessary?	TEC	20.2	56.2	9.0	3.4	--
	COE	8.3	41.6	20.8	5.5	15.2

[1] This response was not included on the questionnaire to advisory council members.

Table 4. Obstacles to the Development of More Effective Collaboration Between TECs and the Institutions of Higher Education

OBSTACLE	Rank	%[1] (N = 89)
lack of adequate rewards to COE faculty for TEC activity	1	43.8
instability of the funding process	2	38.2
shortage of COE resources for TEC activity	3	23.5
university policy/administration outside the COEs	4	24.7
attitudes of COE faculty	5	20.2
at the level of COE administration	5	20.2
because of COE commitment to preservice	6	19.1
in the "monopoly" of TEC activity by COEs (i.e., more services are needed from other parts of the universities)	8	16.8
in the policies of the BOR	8	16.8
in the basic conception of TEC/COE collaboration as legislated	10	12.4
in the TECs themselves	11	12.4
in the skills of COE faculty	12	9.0
There do not seem to be any obstacles		13.5

[1]Percent of respondents who cited item as an obstacle, all ranks.

Table 5. Six Most Frequently Mentioned Obstacles to TEC Collaboration by TEC Subgroup Citing Obstacle (Relative figures)

OBSTACLES	TEACHERS (N = 55)	TEC DIRECTORS (N = 18)	ADMINI-STRATORS (N = 16)	TOTAL (N = 89)
Lack of Rewards	40.0	61.1	37.5	43.8
Unstable Funding	38.2	44.4	31.3	38.2
Resource Shortage	29.1	16.7	12.5	23.6
University Administration/ Policy	21.8	50.0	6.3	24.7
COE Faculty Attitudes	12.7	38.9	25.0	20.2
COE Level Administration	18.2	38.9	6.3	20.2

Table 6. Sources Which Have Helped or Hindered Effective Collaboration Between Colleges of Education and Teacher Education Centers (Relative figures; COE N = 105)

SOURCE	MOSTLY HELPS	MOSTLY HINDERS	HELPS/HINDERS ABOUT EQUALLY
Legislation regarding TEC/ COE collaboration	37.1	17.1	25.7
Funding process	20.0	41.0	20.0
Board of Regents policies	11.4	34.3	27.6
University administration/ policy outside the COE	12.4	38.1	25.7
Administration/policy within the COE	42.9	13.3	24.8
Administration/policy of your department	61.0	6.7	17.1
COE faculty reward system	13.3	36.2	29.5
Reward system at University level	5.7	54.3	20.0
COE faculty attitudes	30.5	17.1	37.1
COE faculty skills	56.2	4.8	22.9
Distribution of COE resources	24.8	26.7	30.5
Types of services requested by TECs	39.0	7.6	34.3

Table 7. Respondent Group by Rating of Collaboration For TEC Among Universities (Relative figures)

	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	TOO MIXED TO SAY
TEC TOTAL (N = 89)	5.6	27.0	28.1	20.2	4.5	1.1

	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	IMPOSSIBLE	UNNECESSARY	NO OPINION
COE TOTAL (N = 105)	13.3	60.0	2.9	4.8	14.3

Causes of Inadequate Collaboration Reside in:	MENTIONED BY %
Lack of time and personnel for inter-institutional roles	55.2
Traditional institutional separateness	46.6
Tendency to compete rather than cooperate	41.9
Short range planning of TEC activity does not allow it	39.0
Turnover of personnel involved in TEC activity is not conducive	13.5

APPENDIX F

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents According to Amount of Time Spent in TEC Activity[1]

Percent of Time	Number	Percent
1-10	30	41.7
11-20	16	22.2
21-30	12	16.6
31-40	7	9.7
41-50	4	5.5
51-60	1	1.4
61-99	1	1.4
100	1	1.4
Total	72	100.0

[1] Does not differentiate between onload and overload activity.

Table 2. Basis of Assignment to TEC Activity.

	N	%
Continuous from year to year	12	16.9
On a yearly basis	12	16.9
On a quarterly basis	15	21.1
To fill a particular need/ request when it arises	32	45.1
TOTAL	71	100.0

Table 3. Types of TEC Activities Performed in 1977-78 by All Respondents[1]; More[2] and Less[3] Active Respondents.

TEC ACTIVITIES	All Respondents N = 61	More Active N = 40	Less Active N = 21
Delivering inservice education	56	36	20
Designing inservice materials/ components	34	26	8
Assessing inservice needs	31	27	4
Evaluating inservice education	22	18	4
Long-term school-based consultant	21	17	4
TEC advisory council member	13	12	1
Coordinator/liaison person from COE to TEC	11	10	1
Implementing new TEC	10	10	0
Research on TEC concept/ impelementation/activities/etc.	10	20	0
In-house administration of COE/TEC activity	9	4	5
Writing/publishing articles on TEC concepts/implementation/ activities/etc.	9	8	0
Writing proposal for establishing TEC	8	6	2
Training COE faculty for TEC service	6	4	1
Training TEC advisory council/ district personnel/ administrators/etc.	5	5	0

1 Sixty-one persons completed this questionnaire item in a manner usable for tabulation.

2 More active respondents are those who indicated on a separate questionnaire item (see Table 1) that they spent more than 20 percent of their time in TEC activity.

3 Less active respondents are those who spent up to 20 percent of their time in TEC activity.

Table 4. Number of COE-TEC Faculty According to Level of Activity and Kinds of Activities Performed in 1977-78.

	Kinds of Activities										
Level of Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
More (N = 40)	3	3	9	7	6	2	4		1	3	2
Less (N = 21)	7	5	6		2	1					

Table 5. Impact of TEC Activity and Present Situation With Respect to Several Aspects of COE Faculty Role (Relative figures; TEC N = 89, COE N = 105)

	Respondent Group	Impact of TEC Activity			The Present Situation		
		Great	Some	None/ Little	Very Good	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory
Redistributing faculty loads	COE	18.1	44.8	28.6	2.9	35.2	53.3
Hiring new faculty with interest in TEC/Public Service	COE	4.8	21.0	63.8	1.9	46.7	41.0
Staff development programs which facilitate contributions by faculty to public service	COE	6.7	31.4	49.5	1.9	46.7	39.0
Development of wider roles for some professors	TEC	10.1	43.8	15.7	6.7	47.2	15.7
Enhancing COE professor's role	COE	7.6	40.0	45.7	6.7	53.3	33.3
Eroding COE professor's role	COE	8.6	28.6	49.5	5.7	56.2	24.8
Individual professors obliged to perform services for which they are not adequately rewarded	TEC	12.4	33.7	21/3	0.0	28.1	39.2
Individual professors obliged to perform roles for which they are not prepared	TEC	12.4	33.7	32.6	5.6	41.6	19.1

Table 6. Preferences Indicated for University-Teacher Education Center Service Based on Contracts (Relative figures)

	COE Faculty (N = 72)	TEC Directors (N = 18)
	YES	YES
Contracts based on long-term programs for specific areas of knowledge/skill	84.7	61.1
Contracts based on long-term programs for specific schools	80.6	55.5
Contracts lasting from several weeks to several months	56.9	44.4
Contracts based on services to be offered and corresponding costs	47.2	33.3

Table 7. Number of Cases[1] and Effect of TEC Activity on Tenure, Promotion and Salary Increases

	Achieved	Denied	Achieved with Difficulty
Tenure	14	8	21
Promotion	12	10	22
Salary increase	24	6	--

1 The numbers of instances reported in these responses most probably include multiple references to the same cases.

Table 8. Status of Rewards for TEC Service as Perceived by COE Faculty (Relative figures; N = 105)

	INCREASING	DECREASING	SAME	DON'T KNOW
Total	24.8	9.5	34.3	29.5
Not Active	15.2	15.2	24.2	42.4
1-10% Active	13.3	6.7	46.7	30.0
11+% Active	40.5	7.1	33.3	19.0

Table 9. Comparison of Professional Rewards for TEC Activity With Rewards for Other Faculty Activities As Perceived by COE Faculty (Relative Figures; N - 105)

	ON CAMPUS TEACHING	RESEARCH	GOVERNANCE	OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE
TEC ACTIVITY				
More rewarded than	3.8	3.8	10.5	29.5
Equally reward as	27.6	5.7	14.3	21.9
Less rewarded than	49.5	68.6	44.8	22.9
No answer	19.1	21.9	30.4	25.7